

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/700,439	11/04/2003	Christopher Burgess	1657/2022	5656	
28524 SIEMENS CO	7590 02/11/200 R POR ATION	EXAM	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT			LONG, SCOTT		
ISELIN, NJ 08	VENUE SOUTH	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1633		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/11/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/700,439	BURGESS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SCOTT D. LONG	1633		

	SCOTT D. LONG	1633						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 21 January 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
I. Some The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 705.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any serned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
NOTICE OF APPEAL		Final California Communication						
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better (d) They are not deemed to place the application in better (d) They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) They are not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e) The not deemed to place the application in better (e)	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);						
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c			ie issues ioi					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number or finally reje	cted claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•						
7. \(\bigcirc \text{propulses of appeal, the proposed amendment(s), a) }\) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) objected to:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of					
Claim(s) rejected: 6 and 7. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant faile e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
	/Janet L. Epps-Ford/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1633						

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In the Remarks (1/21/2008), applicant states "Chan was filed on Spetember 22, 2004 and published on January 11, 2007. The present application was filed on November 4, 2003. Accordingly, Chan is no available as prior ant against the claims of present application. Accordingly the rejection of claims 6-7 for obviousness in view of Su and Chan is improper and should be withdrawn." The examiner applied Chan as a 35 USC 102(e) type reference. Chan has priority to PCTU205/300657, filed on Jan. 8, 2003. According to the examiner's understanding of 35 USC 102(e), Chan is entitled to an effective filing date of at least Jan. 8, 2003. The examiner believes Chan meets the requirements of the 35 USC 102(e) statute.

Believeing that Chan can be used as a prior art reference and further believing that the rejection of claims 6-7 for obviousness in view of Su and Chan is indeed proper, the examiner finds the applicant's argument unpersuasive. Therefore, the examiner hereby maintains the finality of the rejection. Accordingly, the instant claims are rejected for the reasons of record.

/SDL/ Scott Long Patent Examiner Art Unit 1633